



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,624	05/15/2001	Yoko Kobayashi	1614.1166	8014

21171 7590 05/17/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
----------

PITARO, RYAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/854,624	KOBAYASHI, YOKO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Ryan F Pitaro	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-17 have been examined.

***Response to Amendment***

2. This communication is responsive to Amendment C, filed 11/22/2004.
3. Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1,10,15 are independent claims. In the Amendment C, Claims 1,10,15 were amended. This action is non-final.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gavron et al ("Gavron", How to use Microsoft Windows NT4 Workstation, ISBN # 1-56276-445-4) in view of Bolnick et al ("Bolnick", US 6,043,817).

As per claim 1, Gavron teaches a computer-readable recording medium recorded with a data item list display program for causing a computer to function as list display means for displaying a plurality of data items in different display forms in a list, the display forms corresponding to respective attributes of the data items and defining respective ways of displaying the list of data items (Gavron, Page 35, Section 2 and associated figure). In the right portion of the window, the data items are displayed with an icon corresponding to the form of the data item thereby also defining the way in which the data items are displayed. However, Gavron fails to distinctly point out different

display forms based on attributes and a current condition of each of the data items.

Bolnick teaches displaying different display forms based on the attributes and the current condition of each of the data items (Column 7 lines 56-61, Column 8 lines 12-25). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the medium of Gavron with the teaching of Bolnick. Motivation to do so would have been to enhance the variety of rules, which are applied by a display arrangement system to a set of graphical representations on a GUI.

As per claims 2 and 3, which are dependent on claim 1, Gavron does not teach the recording medium as claimed in claim 1, wherein the program causes said list display means to include a table of correspondence between the attributes and the display fonts, and to determine the display forms of the data items displayed in the list by referring to the table by the respective attributes of the data items. However, OFFICIAL NOTICE is given that using a table of correspondence to determine attributes or display stored information about a data item, by means of the table storing the information directly or indirectly, is a widely accepted practice in the art, more commonly noted as a lookup table or LUT. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use a lookup table to determine the icon to display based on the data type because it provides an efficient and reliable way to effectively display such information.

As per claim 4, Gavron-Bolnick teaches varying the dimensions of the icons being displayed (Bolnick, Column 3 lines 24-30, Column 21 lines 38-49). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use the variable

dimensioned icons of Bolnick in the data item list invention of Gavron. Motivation to do so would have been to enhance the variety of rules, which are applied by a display arrangement system to a set of graphical representations on a GUI.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Gavron-Bolnick further teaches the recording medium as claimed in claim 4, wherein the program causes said list display means to function as alignment and display means for aligning and displaying each of the data items of the different display forms (Gavron, Figures 1-2, above).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, Gavron-Bolnick further teaches the recording medium as claimed in claim 5, wherein the program causes said alignment and display means to function as area management means for managing an area in which data items are displayed and an area required to display the data items of the respective display forms (Gavron, Figure 1, above).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 5, Gavron-Bolnick further teaches the recording medium as claimed in claim 5, wherein the program causes said list display means to function as sorting and display means for sorting and displaying the data items of the respective display forms (Gavron, Figures 1-2, above). The data items in Figures 1 and 2 above are sorted alphabetically by data item name.

As per claim 8, Gavron-Bolnick teaches the recording medium as claimed in claim 1, wherein the program causes said list display means to function as column header display means for displaying a column header corresponding to a display form of a selected one of the data items displayed in the list (Gavron, Page 35, Section 2 and associated figure). In the figure, the right side of the screen shows a column header of

Name, indicating that along with the data type depicted by the icon, the name is also listed.

As per claim 9, Gavron-Bolnick teaches the recording medium as claimed in claim 8, wherein the program causes said list display means to function as column display width change means for changing a column display width of one of the data items which one corresponds to a displayed column header by changing a column display width of the displayed column header (Gavron, Page 35, figure in middle of page with callouts).

The figure in the middle of the page depicts column's that are adapted to the size of the information in each column.

Independent claims 10 and 15 are similar in scope to claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Dependent claim 11 is similar in scope to claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Dependent claim 12 is similar in scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Dependent claim 13 is similar in scope to claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Dependent claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

6. Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gavron et al ("Gavron", How to use Microsoft Windows NT4 Workstation, ISBN # 1-56276-445-4) and Bolnick et al ("Bolnick", US 6,043,817 in view of Sullivan ("Sullivan", US# 5,737,557)).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 1, Gavron-Bolnick fails to distinctly point out changing types of fonts based on the display formats. However, Sullivan teaches the recording medium as claimed in claim 1, wherein the program causes said list display means to change types of fonts based on the display forms of the data items in displaying the data items (Sullivan, col. 6, lines 1-8). Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the variable distinguishable fonts of Sullivan in the data item list invention of Gavron-Bolnick because it would increase the visual appeal of icons representative of relatively more significant items, as well as draw the user's attention to certain items (Sullivan, Column 6 lines 13-16)

Dependent claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 16, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8. Furthermore, the Office notes that applicant did not contest the factual assertion set forth under Official Notice on page 4 of the Office Action of 7/22/2004.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Monday-Thursday, and alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro  
Art Unit 2174  
Patent Examiner

RFP

